DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 315 883 EA 021 611

AUTHOR Doyle, Walter
TITLE Classroom Management Techniques and Student Discipline.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Dec 86
NOTE 42p.; Paper prepared for the Student Discipline Strategies project.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Class Activities; *Classroom Techniques; *Discipline; Elementary Secondary Education; Punishment; *Research Needs; *Student Behavior; Suspension; *Theory Practice Relationship

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews concepts and research findings on classroom management techniques and explores how these techniques are related to student discipline strategies. The first section surveys descriptive and experimental research recently accumulated on classroom management practice, concentrating on strategies for monitoring and guiding classroom activity systems. Classroom activities research confirms the relationship of different activity types, classroom physical characteristics, and student choice and mobility to student (mis)behavior and the classroom management demands made on teachers. Management is a cognitive activity based on a teacher's knowledge of classroom event trajectories and the way certain actions will affect situations. Specific management skills are useless without this basic understanding of classrooms. The second section focuses on classroom rules, procedures, and common discipline forms, particularly reprimands and other "desists" to keep order. Research suggests that classroom rules and procedures must be both announced and enforced, and that rule making involves complex interaction processes and negotiations of meaning. The third section examines punishment and supension's effectiveness as discipline strategies for serious classroom disruptions. Also discussed is the applicability of behavior modification procedures to classroom settings. The concluding section evaluates the state of classrooom management and discipline research and identifies implications for research and practice. (92 references) (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: EA

In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the Clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. SP

ED315883

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES AND STUDENT DISCIPLINE

Walter Doyle

University of Arizona

Running Head: Classroom Management

Paper prepared for the Student Discipline Strategies project sponsored by the Education and Society Division of the Office of Research, OERI, U. S. Department of Education.

EA 021 611

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

December 1986

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Classroom Management Techniques and

Student Discipline

Walter Doyle

University of Arizona

The purpose of this paper is to review concepts and research findings on classroom management techniques with special attention to how these techniques are related to student discipline strategies. The discussion opens with a survey of the descriptive and experimental research recently accumulated on classroom management processes, with special attention to strategies for monitoring and guiding classroom activity systems. The second section focuses on classroom rules and procedures and on common forms of classroom discipline, particularly reprimands and other desists teachers use to sustain order. In the third section punishment and suspension are examined in terms of their effectiveness as discipline strategies for serious classroom disruptions. In this section the applicability of behavior modification procedures to classroom setting is also discussed briefly. In the concluding section, a general evaluation of the state of research on classroom management and discipline is assessed and implications for research and practice are identified.

Misbehavior and Order in Classroom Management

Traditionally "misbehavior" has been the dominant theme in discussions of classroom management (see, Johnson & Brooks, 1979). This emphasis is understandable since the need for management and discipline

is most apparent when students are misbehaving. Yet, this preoccupation with misbehavior tended to narrow the scope of research and training in classroom management in at least two ways. First, a focus on misbehavior directed attention to "desists" or actions taken after misbehavior occurs (e.g., reprimands, reinforcement contingencies, or counseling) to a neglect of the organizational strategies teachers use to prevent misbehavior in the first place. Second, misbehavior is a property of individuals, and, thus, a focus on misbehavior led to models of management that were largely individualistic. Within this framework, the structural features of classroom groups were often ignored.

Since Kounin's (1970) classic studies of students' work involvement, however, attention in the field of classroom management has shifted from misbehavior to order, and the consequences of this shift have been substantial. Misbehavior is a property of individuals, but order is a property of a group. The achievement of order requires models that capture social structures and processes in classrooms. From this latter perspective, it soon becomes apparent that classroom order is not a consequence of reactions to misbehavior but a condition established and sustained by the way a teacher organizes and guides a complex system of classroom activities and academic work. The modern emphasis, in other words, is clearly on what teachers do to structure and monitor classroom events before misbehavior occurs. Moreover, the effectiveness of interventions to restore order when misbehavior does occur is seen to depend upon the existence of structures of orderliness in the first place.

The shift from misbehavior to order has changed the language of classroom management and enriched the field by bringing a large body of knowledge on classroom social systems to bear on management issues. As a result, we now understand a great deal about how order is achieved in classroom environments. In the following section, the major findings from research on classroom order are summarized (for details, see Doyle, 1986).

Classroom Activities: The Core of Management

Classrooms are crowded and busy places in which groups of students who vary in interests and abilities must be organized and directed in ways that maximize work involvement and minimize disruptions. Moreover, these groups assemble regularly for long periods of time to accomplish a wide variety of goals. Many events occur simultaneously, teachers must react often and immediately to circumstances, and the course of events is frequently unpredictable. Teaching in such settings requires a highly developed ability to monitor events and interpret situations (see Carter, 1985, 1986). Moreover, the enterprise does not readily lend itself to general rules and directives.

Despite this complexity, we are beginning to understand more clearly that order is achieved through the management of classroom "activities."

Classroom Activities

From an organizational perspective, the central unit of classroom order is the activity. An activity can be defined as a segment of time in which participants are arranged in a specific fashion and communica-

tion follows an identifiable pattern (see Doyle, 1986; Gump, 1969; Ross, 1984; Stodolsky, 1984). A segment of classroom time, such as a spelling test, writing lesson, or study period, can be described, that is, in terms of:

1. Its temporal boundaries or duration.
2. The physical milieu, that is, the shape of the site in which it occurs, the number and types of participants, the arrangement of participants in the available space, and the props or objects available to participants.
3. The behavior format or program of action for participants.
4. The focal content or concern of the segment.

The concept of "program of action" is key to modern understandings of classroom management and order. Each activity defines a distinctive action structure that provides direction for events and "pulls" participants along a particular path at a given pace (see Merritt, 1982; Gump, 1982). In seatwork, for example, students are usually expected to work privately and independently at their desks, attend to a single information source such as a textbook or worksheet, and finish within a specified time. In whole-class discussion, on the other hand, students are expected to speak publicly and monitor information from multiple sources.

To say a classroom is orderly, then, means that students are cooperating in the program of action defined by the activity a teacher is attempting to use. Misbehavior, in turn, is any action by students that threatens to disrupt the activity flow or pull the class toward an

alternative program of action. If order is not defined in a particular setting, i.e., if an activity system is not established and running in a classroom, no amount of discipline will create order.

Major findings from research on classroom activities, most of which has been conducted in elementary classes, can be summarized as follows (for details, see Doyle, 1986):

1. Activity types are systematically related to the behavior of students and thus place different classroom management demands on teachers. In a study of third-grade classes Gump (1969) found, for instance, that involvement was highest for students in teacher-led small groups and lowest for pupil presentations. Between these extremes, engagement was higher in whole-class recitation, tests, and teachers presentations than in supervised study and independent seatwork. Similar results in elementary classes have been reported by other investigators (see Ross, 1984).

2. The physical characteristics of a classroom, including the density of students, the arrangement of desks, and the design of the building (open space vs. self-contained) also affect the probability of inappropriate and disruptive behavior as well as the difficulties a teacher encounters in preventing or stopping such behavior (Gump, 1982; Weinstein, 1979).

3. The greater the amount of student choice and mobility and the greater the complexity of the social scene, the greater the need for overt managing and controlling actions by the teacher (Kounin & Gump, 1974).

4. The type of work students are assigned affects classroom order (see Carter & Doyle, 1986). When academic work is routinized and familiar to students (e.g., spelling tests or recurring worksheet exercises), the flow of classroom activity is typically smooth and well ordered. When work is problem-centered, that is, students are required to interpret situations and make decisions to accomplish tasks (e.g., word problems or essays), activity flow is frequently slow and bumpy. Managing higher-order tasks requires exceptional management skill.

Establishing Classroom Activities

In the early 1900s, Bagley (1907) exhorted teachers that "the only way absolutely to insure a school against waste is to make the very first day thoroughly rigorous in all its details" (p. 22). Modern research has confirmed the validity of Bagley's pronouncement. One of the central findings of recent classroom studies is that the level of order created during the first few days of school reliably predicts the degree of student engagement and disruption for the rest of the year (see Emmer, Evertson, & Anderson, 1980). As a result, effective teachers at both elementary and junior high school levels expend considerable energy at the beginning of the school year establishing activities and hovering over them until they operate automatically (see Ball, 1980; Doyle, 1984; Smith & Geoffrey, 1968). Although few "turn-around" studies have been conducted, the available evidence as well as common knowledge among experienced teachers indicates that, if this important step is missed, it is extremely difficult to create order later in the year (see Doyle, 1984).

Most studies indicate that successful classroom managers rely on three basic strategies to establish order at the beginning of the year: simplicity, familiarity, and routinization (for a summary, see Doyle, 1986). Early activities, in other words, have simple organizational structures which are typically quite familiar to students (e.g., whole-class presentations and seatwork rather than multiple small groups). The first assignments, in turn, are easy for the students to accomplish in relatively short periods of time and have clear specifications. Moreover, they are often based on work the students can be expected to have done the previous year. A significant chunk of the management task, then, is solved by selecting appropriate activities and assignments for the opening of school. Proper selection is supplemented by routinizing the activity system for the class (see Yinger, 1980). Teachers repeat the same activity forms for the first weeks to familiarize students with standard procedures and provide opportunities to rehearse them. This routinizing of activities helps sustain classroom order by making events less susceptible to breakdowns because participants know the normal sequence of action.

Monitoring and Guiding Classroom Events

Kounin's (1970) widely influential studies of group management processes in classrooms pointed to the key role of monitoring in establishing and maintaining classroom activities. Kounin found that teachers with high levels of "withitness" (awareness of what was going on the classroom) and "overlapping" (ability to attend to two or more

events at the same time) had high levels of work involvement and low levels of inappropriate and disruptive behavior.

The content of monitoring--what teachers watch when scanning a room--includes at least three dimensions. First, teachers watch groups, that is, they attend to what is happening in the entire room and how well the total activity system is going. A group focus does not preclude attention to individual students, but localized attending must be scheduled within the broader framework of the group activity (see Merritt, 1982). Second, teachers watch conduct or behavior, with particular attention to discrepancies from the intended program of action. This enables teachers to recognize misbehavior early, stop it before it spreads, and select the appropriate target for intervention (Emmer et al., 1980; Kounin, 1970). Third, teachers monitor the pace, rhythm, and duration of classroom events. Several studies have shown that pace, momentum, and rhythm are key factors in maintaining an activity in a classroom (Arlin, 1982; Erickson & Mohatt, 1982; Gump, 1969) Excessive delays in the flow of classroom events or abrupt shifts in direction are often associated with inappropriate or disruptive student behavior (see Kounin, 1970).

Obviously, situational factors influence the monitoring and guiding processes in classroom management. The more complex the arrangement of students in a class and the greater the demands on the teacher as an actor in the activity system, the more difficult monitoring and cueing become and, thus, the greater the probability of a breakdown in order. This effect was clear in a series of naturalistic and experimental

studies conducted by Arlin (1982). Arlin found that mastery learning designs, in which achievement is set at mastery and the time students need to learn is allowed to vary, magnified the effect of learning rate differences among students in a class and created delays as teachers worked with the small number of students who did not achieve mastery. This disruptions of activity momentum generated serious problems of management and order for teachers. Arlin's findings suggest that highly differentiated instructional systems are inherently difficult to manage in classrooms.

Summary. From the perspective outlined here, teaching in classrooms demands a high degree of efficiency in information processing and an ability to predict the direction of events and make decisions rapidly. For this reason, management is fundamentally a cognitive activity based on a teacher's knowledge of the likely trajectory of events in classrooms and the way specific actions affect situations (see Carter, 1985, 1986). Specific management skills are, for all practical purposes, useless without this basic understanding of classrooms.

Rules and Reprimands: The Core of Classroom Discipline

Because classrooms are populated by groups of students assembled under crowded conditions for relatively long periods of time to accomplish specified purposes, life in these settings is governed by a variety of explicit and implicit rules and procedures (see Blumenfeld, Hamilton, Wessels, & Falkner, 1979, and Jackson, 1968, on elementary schools and Hargreaves, Hester, & Mellor, 1975, and Smith & Geoffrey, 1968, on secondary schools). Considerable space have been devoted to

The rule making process is especially salient in the present context because most incidents of misbehavior and discipline involve the violation of classroom or school rules.

The Importance of Rules.

Classroom rules are usually intended to regulate forms of individual conduct that are likely to disrupt activities, cause injury, or damage school property. Thus, there are rules concerning tardiness, talking during lessons, gum chewing, fighting, bringing materials to class, and the like (see Hargreaves et al., 1975; Tikunoff & Ward, 1978). In addition, there are a large number of implicit rules (e.g., patterns of turn taking in discussions or conventions for social distance between pupils) that affect social interaction and interpersonal relationships in classrooms (see Erickson & Shultz, 1981; McHoul, 1978). Finally, there is typically a set of classroom procedures, that is, approved ways of taking care of various responsibilities and privileges, such as handing in completed work, sharpening pencils, getting a drink of water, going to the restroom, or forming groups for reading or math.

Studies at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education (Emmer, Evertson, & Anderson, 1980; Emmer, Sanford, Evertson, Clements, & Martin, 1981; Emmer, Sanford, Clements, & Martin, 1982; Evertson & Emmer, 1982) have indicated that effective classroom managers in elementary and junior high school classes are especially skilled in establishing rules and procedures at the beginning of the year.

In elementary classes, the investigators found that nearly all teachers introduced rules and procedures on the first day of school. In classes of effective managers (selected on indicators of management processes and student achievement), however, rules and procedures were concrete and explicit and covered matters directly related to work accomplishment. In addition, effective managers deliberately taught their operating systems to the students. They clearly explained rules and procedures to students, established signals to indicate when actions were to be carried out or stopped, and spent time rehearsing procedures. In addition, effective managers anticipated possible interruptions or problems and had procedures readily available to handle these situations. Finally, effective managers monitored classes closely, stopped inappropriate behavior promptly, and continued to remind students of the rules and procedures during the first weeks of school. In contrast, less effective managers either failed to anticipate the need for rules and procedures covering important aspects of class operation or tended to have vague and unenforceable rules (e.g., "Be in the right place at the right time"). Moreover, they neither explained their rules and procedures clearly to students nor monitored and enforced compliance. They seemed, rather, to be preoccupied with clerical tasks and disoriented by problems and interruptions.

In junior high school classes, the researchers found that all teachers presented rules and procedures at the beginning of the year, and there were few differences across teachers in the time spent on these matters. Differences were found, however, in the clarity and

thoroughness of presentation and in the monitoring and enforcement of compliance. Successful managers, in contrast to their less effective colleagues, anticipated problems, communicated rules and expectations clearly, watched students closely, intervened promptly, and invoked consequences for behavior. These results were consistent with those for elementary classes, but less time was spent teaching and rehearsing rules and procedures at the junior high level.

Rule Making and Enactment Processes.

Creating a rule system in a classroom is a difficult task to accomplish for at least three reasons. First, classroom rules are situational (see Bremme and Erickson, 1977; Wallat & Green, 1979). As Hargreaves and his colleagues (1975) have observed, different rules apply to different phases of lessons. Quiet talk among peers, for example, is allowed during entry and seatwork but not during teacher presentations or recitations. Similarly, orderliness in group activities that involve speaking, listening, and turn-taking differs substantially from that required for seatwork (see Au, 1980; Cazden, 1986). Second, order is "jointly constituted" by the participants in activities (see Buckley & Cooper, 1978; Erickson & Shultz, 1981; Sieber, 1979). That is, order is achieved with students and depends upon their willingness to follow along with the unfolding of an event. Whether or not students play an official role in defining or choosing classroom rules, they shape, through cooperation and resistance, the rules that are actually established in a particular class. Finally, teachers must balance activity management with rule enforcement. Time taken to deal

publicly with rule violations distracts attention away from the main activity system. And, if rule violations are frequent, misbehavior rather than academic work can become the operating curriculum in a class. For this reason, experienced teachers tend to push ahead with activities and endeavor to make reprimands brief and private (see Carter, 1985; Doyle, 1984). [This point will be discussed more fully in the following section on misbehavior and interventions.]

A considerable amount of research has been done on the interactional competence students need to participate successfully in the complex rule systems of classrooms (see Cook-Gumperz & Gumperz, 1982; Erickson & Shultz, 1981; Green & Harker, 1982; Mehan, 1980). Although most students learn classroom rules and procedures readily (LeCompte, 1978), low ability students and students from minority cultures sometimes have special problems comprehending the classroom system and recognizing context cues for appropriate behavior (see Eder, 1982; Florio & Shultz, 1979; Philips, 1972). In other words, if a student's preschool or extraschool experiences do not foster understandings and behaviors congruent with classroom demands, it is sometimes difficult for him or her to follow rules and procedures, gain access to lessons, or display competence. Suggestions for improving such situations include more explicit teaching of classroom rules and appropriate behavior (Cartledge & Milburn, 1978; Shultz & Florio, 1979) and the design of classroom procedures in ways that are congruent with patterns of communicating in specific cultures (Cazden, 1986; Erickson & Mohatt, 1982).

It is curious, however, that rule making appears to be an important opening ritual for both elementary and secondary classes despite the fact that most children seem to learn the classroom system during their first year or so of schooling (see Blumenfeld at al., 1979; LeCompte, 1980; Wallat & Green, 1979). It is unlikely that even third grade students are learning anything new when they encounter rules on the first day of school or that junior high students are unaware of the general expectations for acceptable behavior in classrooms.

Reflection on this situation suggests that by giving explicit attention to rules and procedures a teacher acknowledges the importance of order and signals the level of vigilance and accountability that will prevail in a particular classroom (see Ball, 1980; Doyle, 1979). By setting rules, a teacher communicates his or her awareness of what can happen in a classroom and demonstrates a degree of commitment to work. Students are thus able to acquire valuable information early in the year about a teacher's approach and expectations. The more explicit the rules and the more clearly they are communicated, the more likely the teacher cares about maintaining order and is skilled in handling inappropriate and disruptive behavior. But simply stating the rules is not enough. A teacher must also demonstrate a willingness and an ability to act when rules are broken. For this reason, reprimands and consequences play an important role in rule making.

In summary, research suggests that rules and procedures in classrooms must be both announced and enforced and rule making involves complex processes of interaction and the negotiation of meaning. The

implication here is that rule making cannot be easily captured in a list of directives or techniques. To be effective participants in the rule making process, teachers must understand what they are attempting to orchestrate and how situations shape actions.

Misbehavior and Interventions

The central message of modern research on classroom management is that misbehavior and actions teachers take to stop it are embedded in the activity system of a classroom. This viewpoint has implications for understanding the nature of misbehavior and the character of appropriate disciplinary strategies for classroom use.

Misbehavior. Despite popular reports of violence and crime in schools, most problems of misbehavior in classrooms are related to attention, crowd control, and getting work accomplished (see Duke, 1978). Some student actions, such as tardiness or inappropriate dress, are usually governed by school-wide policies and rules. But most misbehavior in classrooms is not that clearly defined. Actions that would appear to an outside observer to be similar, are often treated quite differently by a teachers depending upon who performs them at what time in what context (see Metz, 1978). This differential treatment is not usually a sign of teacher incompetence or even inconsistency. Rather, it reflects the context dependency of rules and the differential consequences of actions in the behavior stream of classrooms.

The key to understanding misbehavior in classrooms is to view what students do in terms of its consistency with the main program of activity for the class. From this perspective, misbehavior is any

student act that initiates a competing vector or program for the class. Vectors perceived as misbehavior are likely to be public, that is, visible to a significant portion of the class, and contagious, that is, capable of spreading rapidly or pulling other members of the class into them. For classes in which the primary vector is weak (i.e., students are easily distracted from academic work) and actions outside the primary vector are frequent, misbehavior is likely to be common (see Felmlee & Eder, 1983; Metz, 1978).

By this definition, not every infraction of a rule is necessarily misbehavior. Talking out of turn is not misbehavior if it advances the lesson at a time when moving forward is essential. Similarly, inattention during the last few minutes of a class session will often be tolerated because the activity is coming to an end. On the other hand, consistent delays in conforming to directives can slow down activity flow and irritate a teacher (Brooks & Wagenhauser, 1980).

Interventions. McDermott (1976) has documented that students in both high and low ability groups respond almost immediately to departures from the primary program of action and begin to signal through posture and glances their awareness of "disorder." Nevertheless, the teacher is the primary custodian of order in a class and must frequently decide when and how to intervene to repair order.

In a study of third and fifth grade classes, Sieber (1976) found that interventions to stop misbehavior occurred at a rate of about 16 per hour. Despite their frequency, such interventions are inherently risky because they call attention to potentially disruptive behavior,

and, as a classroom event, they initiate a program of action that can pull a class further away from the primary vector and weaken its function in holding order in place. There is, in other words, a "ripple" effect for interventions (Kounin & Gump, 1958). Because of these risks, interventions often have a private and fleeting quality that minimizes their effect on the flow of events. Successful interventions occur early in response to misbehavior, are often quite brief, and do not invite further comment from the target student or students. Thus, teachers tend to use a variety of unobtrusive nonverbal signals (e.g., gestures, direct eye contact, and proximity) to regulate misbehavior, and the majority of spoken interventions consist of simple reprimands: "Shh," "Wait," "Stop," or "No" (Humphrey, 1979; Sieber, 1976).

Decisions to intervene are necessarily reactive and problematic. Most studies indicate that teachers decide to intervene on the basis of their knowledge of who is misbehaving, what the misbehavior is, and when it occurs (Cone, 1978; Pittman, 1985). Hargreaves and his colleagues (1975) noted that early cues of possible misbehavior, (e.g., concealment) are ambiguous and yet the teacher has little time to form a judgment and act. To reduce uncertainty, teachers classify students in terms of such factors as their persistence and their visibility in the social structure of the group.

School Discipline Strategies

Management effectiveness studies have established that successful managers plan for and invoke consequences for rule violations (see Emmer

et al., 1981). In most instances, a simple reprimand or similar intervention is sufficient to correct a violation, especially in a well managed class. Indeed, teacher interventions to restore order are remarkably soft primarily because most misbehavior in classrooms is not a serious threat to order or safety and is only weakly motivated. Most students appear to misbehave to create opportunities for "goofing off" (Allen, 1983; Cusick, Martin, & Palonsky, 1976), test the boundaries of a teacher's management system (Doyle, 1979), or negotiate work requirements (Doyle & Carter, 1984). In some instances, however, serious and chronic misbehavior, such as rudeness or aggressiveness toward the teacher, consistent avoidance of work and ignoring of common rules, or fighting, occurs in elementary and secondary classrooms. In the face of these behavior problems, common classroom forms of management--activity systems and reprimands--are often ineffectual and stronger consequences are needed.

Several comprehensive discipline models have been proposed that deal in part with serious behavior problems (see Charles, 1981; Hyman, Bilus, Dennehy, Feldman, Flanagan, Lovoratano, Maital, & McDowell, 1979). In another paper for this conference, Emmer is examining these models in considerable depth. In this paper, attention is given to two forms of discipline: (a) the traditional practices of punishment and suspension; and (b) behavior modification. There are two significant features of this discussion. First, serious misbehavior is typically governed by school-level policies and procedures and is, therefore, necessarily beyond the domain of the individual teacher. Discipline is

being examined here primarily from the perspective of the classroom, i.e., in terms of the appropriateness and effectiveness of practices for classroom management and order. Second, the focus is on serious rule violations that occur, albeit only occasionally, in well managed classes. Serious violations can occur frequently in poorly managed classes, but consequences in such situations are not the issue. Rather, correction of the management system is the first order of business. Indeed, concentrating on strong consequences in poorly managed classes is likely to make matters worse in the long run.

Punishment and Suspension

Historically, punishment (extra work, detention, paddling) and suspension or even expulsion have been the most common techniques for handling serious behavior problems in schools (see Doyle, 1978). It appears that these practices are still used widely in American schools today (Rose, 1984). In this section, I attempt to delineate the issues and research findings related to punishment and suspension as classroom management strategies.

At an immediate level, suspension is "effective" for removing a threat to order from the classroom. Similarly, punishment can sometimes inhibit or suppress misbehavior (see O'Leary & O'Leary, 1977), although it is often difficult to administer during class time. But are suspension and punishment effective consequences to use in response to serious rule violations in classrooms? Unfortunately, very little systematic empirical research exists to answer this question (see Hapkiewicz, 1975). Rather, most of the literature on these techniques addresses

legal or moral issues and, thus, either ignores or assumes efficacy. How, then, can the strategies be assessed in light of present knowledge?

Decisions about punishment and suspension need to be based on at least two considerations: for whom are they effective and what are the effects. Serious misbehavior is usually exhibited by two types of students: (a) those who are, for a variety of reasons, strongly motivated to be disruptive; or (b) those who, because of ability or inclination, do not readily engage in academic work. The latter type of students are not necessarily strongly motivated to misbehave, but they are not easily "caught" by the typical programs of action in classrooms. Clearly different decisions about the appropriateness of punishment or suspension are likely to be made depending upon which type of student is misbehaving. It is important to add that minority students are often disproportionately represented among students who are targets for punishment or suspension (see Leonard, 1984; Parents Union for Public Schools, 1982; Stevens, 1983).

The effects of punishment depend in part upon the type and consistency of the punishment used. Mild forms, such as loss of privileges, demerits, or detention can effectively communicate seriousness and a concern for civility in classrooms (see Brophy, 1983). Emmer (1984) reviewed laboratory studies by Parke and associates (Duer & Parke, 1970; Parke & Duer, 1972; Sawin & Parke, 1979) on the importance of consistency in the administration of punishment. In these studies it was found that inconsistency in punishing young boys for hitting a doll inhibited the behavior in some subjects but increased it to an extremely

high level in others. Moreover, once the response to inconsistent punishment was established, it was very difficult to change by improving consistency.

Stronger punishment, especially corporal punishment, is more controversial. Evidence indicates that corporal punishment is widely used in schools and appears to have considerable "practical" appeal for administrators and teachers (Rose, 1984). Indeed, Hyman (1981) has documented instances of school punishment that are quite extreme: e.g., hitting students with sticks, arrows, belts, and fists; cutting their hair; confining them to storerooms; withholding food; and throwing them against walls. Yet most commentators, and especially those who draw upon behavioral psychology, argue that: (a) the effects of corporal punishment are unpredictable, i.e., it can actually be reinforcing because the student gains attention and status among peers; (b) corporal punishment creates resentment and hostility in the target student, thus making it more difficult to establish a working relationship in the future; and (c) severe punishment inhibits unwanted behavior but does not itself foster appropriate behavior (Brophy, 1983; Hapkiewicz, 1975; O'Leary & O'Leary, 1977). Bongiavanni (1979) reviewed evidence that frequent use of corporal punishment is associated with such undesirable consequences as increased school vandalism. He also reported preliminary results of a survey indicating that most school districts which had eliminated corporal punishment did not experience an increase in school behavior problems.

A similar argument can be made for suspension from school as a discipline strategy. Suspension is widely used (see Stevens, 1983), but there is little evidence that suspension is, by itself, educative. Indeed, suspension denies educative opportunities for precisely those students who need them the most. Moreover, suspension can be inherently rewarding, a vacation from a setting the student is likely to find aversive. Under such circumstances, little long-term effectiveness can be expected from suspension. It is frequently argued that suspension or expulsion makes a school more orderly and effective for the rest of the students who suffer from a disruptive environment. Unfortunately, little systematic research exists to support or refute this hypothesis.

Studies of suspension in Cleveland (Stevens, 1983) and Philadelphia (Parents Union for Public Schools, 1982) indicate that there is wide variation across schools in suspension rates. In the Philadelphia study it was found that schools with low suspension rates had high levels of community involvement, emphasized instruction rather than control, and had a student-centered environment. In high-rate schools, suspensions were used as a means of bringing parents into the school and school administrators concentrated primarily on standards and control rather than instruction.

Several schools and school districts have established alternative or in-school suspension programs. In many instances these programs emphasize punishment rather than academic work or remediation of behavior problems (see Garibaldi, 1979; Short & Noblit, 1985). More elaborate programs, such as the Portland PASS program (see Leonard,

1984), which include parent and community involvement and student training in academic survival skills appear to be successful in reducing suspension rates and improving student behavior. The message of these programs is clear: for suspension to have a long-term effect on students' conduct, significant resources must be invested in dealing with the problems that led to the need for suspending a student.

Analysis of the effects of punishment and suspension suggest that these strategies are not, by themselves, educative. To be effective, they must be invoked within a clear system of rules and standards so that appropriate behavior is the essential focus.

Behavior Modification

Techniques derived from laboratory studies of contingencies of reinforcement have been researched extensively and advocated widely as discipline strategies. Controlled studies, often in special settings have indicated that behavior modification techniques are remarkably successful. Nevertheless, there has been considerable controversy surrounding this approach and questions have been raised about its practicality for classroom teachers.

Several useful studies, reviews, and collections on behavior modification techniques have appeared recently (see Brophy, 1983; Elardo, 1978; Emmer, 1984; Lahey & Rubinoff, 1981; McLaughlin, 1976; O'Leary & O'Leary, 1977; Thompson, Brassell, Persons, Tucker, & Rollins, 1974; Walker & Holland, 1979; Workman & Hector, 1978). The weight of the evidence suggests that most of the early recommendations for elaborate and complex systems of token economies, systematic contingency

management, and ignoring undesirable behavior while praising desired behavior are impractical for individual classroom teachers who lack the assistance of independent observers and support personnel and who work with large groups of students in noncustodial settings. Moreover, using rewards for desired behavior or for academic performance can have deleterious effects when intrinsic motivation is moderate to high (see Leeper & Greene, 1978). Moreover, there are problems of generalizing the effects of behavior modification interventions across settings and maintaining their effects over time (see Phillips & Ray, 1980).

Attention has recently turned to systems for teaching students social skills (Cartledge & Milburn, 1978), coping strategies (Spaulding, 1983), and participation skills (Cohen, 1979) in which appropriate behaviors for classroom settings are identified and systematically taught to students. Along similar lines, some investigators have advocated that students by taught self-monitoring and self-control strategies which enable them to guide their own learning in classrooms (see Anderson & Prawat, 1983; Brophy, 1983). The emphasis, in other words, is moving toward helping students learn to cope with classroom processes rather than having teachers implement behavior modification programs in their classrooms. Such an approach would seem to be especially useful for students who do not readily participate in academic activities and are not strongly motivated to be disruptive. There is less evidence that such an approach will be successful with students who are strongly motivated to be disruptive in school.

Appraisal and Conclusion

The need for management and discipline is most apparent when order is disrupted. As a result, interventions to stop misbehavior have often been the primary focus of theory and research in classroom management. Evidence accumulated in the last two decades suggests, however, that interventions are best viewed as ways order is repaired rather than created. The quantity or quality of intervention will not predict the degree of order in a classroom unless a program of action has already been established. Moreover, stopping misbehavior involves complex decisions about the probable consequences of particular actions by particular students at specific moments in the flow of activity in a class. And, because misbehavior and a teacher's reaction to misbehavior are themselves vectors of action in a classroom, successful managers are able to insert interventions skillfully into the activity flow. They keep everyone focused, in other words, on the primary vector that sustains order in classrooms.

The research summarized in this paper clearly indicates that substantial progress has been made in identifying effective classroom management practices and delineating the knowledge structures which underlie the use of these practices in classrooms. Two important limitations of this work need to be pointed out, however. First, much of the research on classroom management has been conducted in elementary classrooms. Some junior high school and a few senior high school studies exist, particularly in research on managing academic work. Nevertheless, more needs to be known about classroom management

processes and strategies at the secondary level and about differences between elementary and secondary classrooms on dimensions relevant to classroom management and order. Second, the vast majority of management studies have been conducted in relatively "normal" or "plain vanilla" school settings. I am not aware of classroom studies that have been done in schools with serious problems of violence and crime or which have focused on serious school disruption as a factor in achieving classroom order. Indeed, there are few studies (e.g., Metz, 1978) that have given attention to connections between classroom and school level dimensions.

More field-based research on the effects of school discipline strategies such as punishment and suspension is clearly needed. In particular, we need to know more about:

1. The effects of punishment and suspension on the students who receive them. Which students are most likely to be punished or suspended? Do these students modify their attitudes or behavior when they return to the classroom? What is the rate of "repeat" offenders?

2. The effects of punishment and suspension on classrooms and schools. Does the use of punishment or suspension "improve" classroom order and school safety? Under what circumstances? How do school discipline programs affect teachers and classroom processes?

Before these questions can be answered, however, there is a need to understand more about school discipline processes themselves. How is punishment or suspension carried out? What conditions trigger a need for such actions? Existing evidence suggests that there is considerable

variability between schools serving similar populations on rates of punishment and suspension and that individual schools vary across time? Why is this so? How does it happen? To gain this knowledge we need more detailed case studies of incidents in which school discipline practices are applied.

In planning research on school discipline strategies, however, at least three cautions are in order. First, one wonders how researchable many questions of school discipline are. Discipline problems are emotionally charged and surrounded by legal and moral issues. In such a climate, the disinterested manipulation of variables or passive observation of behavior is not likely to happen. Second, discipline strategies such as corporal punishment and suspension are likely to be applied to cases of serious and strongly motivated misbehavior. In such situations, the probability of success is necessarily quite low. Thus, resolving questions concerning the effectiveness of these discipline strategies is extremely difficult. Finally, one of the clear messages of modern classroom management research is that the search for specific, transportable strategies is misdirected. Classroom researchers found that the answer to management problems lies first in understanding the problem. The knowledge of most use, then, is that which empowers teachers to <u>interpret</u> a situation appropriately so that whatever action is taken, whether in establishing conditions for order at the beginning of the year or in responding to misbehavior, will address the problem at hand.

In the end what is needed most are more disciplined ways of thinking about school discipline problems, ways that are consistent with emerging knowledge of how classrooms and schools work and grounded in a greater understanding of the contours and texture of school order and disruption.

References

Allen, J. D. (1983). Classroom management: Students' perspectives, goals, strategies. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.

Anderson, L., & Prawat, R. (1983). A synthesis of research on teaching self-control. Educational Leadership, 40, 62-66.

Arlin, M. (1979). Teacher transitions can disrupt time flow in classrooms. American Educational Research Journal, 16, 42-56.

Arlin, M. (1982). Teacher responses to student time differences in mastery learning. American Journal of Education, 90, 334-352.

Au, K. K. (1980). Participation structures in a reading lesson with Hawaiian children: Analysis of a culturally appropriate instructional event. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 11, 91-115.

Bagley, W. C. (1907). Classroom management: Its principles and technique. New York: Macmillan.

Ball, S. J. (1980). Initial encounters in the classroom and the processes of establishment. In P. Woods (Ed.), Pupil strategies. London: Croom Helm.

Blumenfeld, P. C., Hamilton, V. L., Wessels, K., & Falkner, D. (1979). Teaching responsibility to first graders. Theory into Practice, 18(3), 174-180.

Blumenfeld, P. C., Pintrich, P. R., Meece, J., & Wessels, K. (1982). The formation and role of self perceptions of ability in elementary classrooms. In W. Doyle & T. L. Good (Eds.), Focus on teaching. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bongiavanni, A. F. (1979). A review of research on the effects of punishment: Implications for corporal punishment in the schools. In I. A. Hyman & H. Wise (Eds.), Corporal punishment in American education: Research in history, practice, and alternatives. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Bremme, D., & Erickson, F. (1977). Relationships among verbal and nonverbal classroom behaviors. Theory into Practice, 5, 153-161.

Brooks, D. M., & Wagenhauser, B. (1980). Completion time as a nonverbal component of teacher attitude. Elementary School Journal, 81, 24-27.

Brophy, J. E. (1983). Classroom organization and management. Elementary School Journal, 83, 265-286.

Buckley, P. K., & Cooper, J. M. (1978). An ethnographic study of an elementary school teacher's establishment and maintenance of group norms. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto.

Carter, K. (1985). Teacher comprehension of classroom processes: An emerging direction in classroom management research, paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Carter, K. (1986). Classroom management as cognitive problem solving: Toward teacher comprehension in teacher education, paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Carter, K., & Doyle, W. (1982). Variations in academic tasks in high- and average-ability classes. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Carter, K., and Doyle, W. (1986). Teachers' knowledge structures and comprehension processes. In J. Calderhead, (Ed.), Exploring Teachers' Thinking. London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Cartledge, G., & Milburn, J. (1978). The case for teaching social skills in the classroom: A review. Review of Educational Research, 48, 1330156.

Cazden, C. B. (1986). Classroom discourse. In M C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching, 3rd ed. New York: Macmillan.

Charles, C. M. (1981). Building classroom discipline. New York: Longman.

Cohen, E. G. (1979). Status equalizaztion in the desegregated school. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Cone, R. (1978). Teachers' decision in managing student behavior. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto.

Cook-Gumperz, J., & Gumperz, J. J. (1982). Communicative competence in educational perspective. In L. C. Wilkinson (Ed.), Communicating in the classroom. New York: Academic Press.

Cusick, P. A., Martin, W., & Palonsky, S. (1976). Organizational structure and student behaviour in secondary school. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 8, 3-14.

Doyle, W. (1978). Are students behaving worse than they used to behave? Journal of Research and Development in Education, 2(4), 3-16.

Doyle, W. (1979). Making managerial decisions in classrooms. In D. L. Duke (Ed.), Classroom management (78th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 2). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Doyle, W. (1983). Academic work. Review of Educational Research, 53, 159-199.

Doyle, W. (1984). How order is achieved in classrooms: An interim report. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 16, 259-277.

Doyle, W. (1986). Classroom organization and management. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching, 3rd ed. New York: Macmillan.

Doyle, W., & Carter, K. (1984). Academic tasks in classrooms. Curriculum Inquiry, 14, 129-149.

Doyle, W., Sanford, J. P., French, B. S., Emmer, E. T., & Clements, B. S. (1985). Patterns of academic work in junior high school science, English, and mathematics classes: A final report (R&D Rep. 6190). Austin: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Duer, J. L., & Parke, R. D. (1970). Effects of inconsistent punishment and agression in children. Developmental Psychology, 2, 403-411.

Duke, D. L. (1978). How administrators view the crisis in school discipline. Phi Delta Kappan, 59, 325-330.

Eder, D. (1982). Differences in communicative styles across ability groups. In L. C. Wilkinson (Ed.), Communicating in classrooms. New York: Academic Press.

Elardo, R. (1978). Behavior modification in an elementary school: Problems and issues. Phi Delta Kappan, 59, 334-338.

Emmer, E. T., (1984). Classroom management: Research and implications (R&D Rep. No. 6178). Austin: University of Texas, R & D Center for Teacher Education.

Emmer, E. T., Evertson, C. M., & Anderson, L. M. (1980). Effective classroom management at the beginning of the school year. Elementary School Journal, 80, 219-231.

Emmer, E. T., Sanford, J. P., Clements, B. S., & Martin, J. (1982). Improving classroom management and organization in junior high schools: An experimental investigation (R&D Rep. No. 6153). Austin: University of Texas, R & D Center for Teacher Education.

Emmer, E. T., Sanford, J. P., Evertson, C. M., Clements, B. S., & Martin, J. (1981). The Classroom Management Improvement Study: An experiment in elementary school classrooms (R&D Rep. No. 6050). Austin: University of Texas, R & D Center for Teacher Education.

Erickson, F., & Mohatt, G. (1982). Cultural organization of participation structures in two classrooms of Indian students. In G. Spindler (Ed.), Doing the ethnography of schooling. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Erickson, F., & Shultz, J. (1981). When is a context? Some issues and methods in the analysis of social competence. In J. L. Green & C. Wallat (Eds.), Ethnography and language in educational settings. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Evertson, C. M., & Emmer, E. T. (1982). Effective management at the beginning of the year in junior high classes. Journal of Educational Psychology, 74, 485-498.

Felmlee, D., & Eder, D. (1983). Contextual effects in the classroom: The impact of ability groups on group attention. Sociology of Education, 56, 77-87.

Florio, S., & Shultz, J. (1979). Social competence at home and at school. Theory into Practice, 18, 234-243.

Garibaldi, A. M. (1979). In-school alternatives to suspension: Trendy educational innovations. Urban Review, 11(2), 97-103.

Green, J. L., & Harker, J. O. (1982). Gaining access to learning: Conversational, social, and cognitive demands of group participation. In L. C. Wilkinson (Ed.), Communicating in classrooms. New York: Academic Press.

Gump, P. V. (1969). Intra-setting analysis: The third grade classroom as a special but instructive case. In E. Willems and H. Rausch (Eds.), Naturalistic viewpoints in psychological research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Gump, P. V. (1982). School settings and their keeping. In D. L. Duke (Ed.), Helping teachers manage classrooms. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Hagreaves, D. H., Hestor, S. K., & Mellor, F. J. (1975). Deviance in classrooms. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Hapkiewicz, W. G. (1975). Research on corporal punishment effectiveness: Contributions and limitations. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.

Humphrey, F. M. (1979). "Shh!": A sociolinguistic study of teachers' turn-taking sanctions in primary school lessons. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

Hyman, I. A. (1981). Violence, stress and punitiveness: Educational and social policy implication for the 80s. Journal of the International Association of Pupil Personnel Workers, 25, 174-189.

Hyman, I. A., Bilus, F., Dennehy, N., Feldman, G., Flanagan, D., Lovoratano, J., Maital, S., & McDowell, E. (1979). Discipline in American education: An overview and analysis. Journal of Education, 161(2), 51-70.

Jackson, P. W. (1968). Life in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Johnson, M., & Brooks, H. (1979). Conceptualizing classroom management. In D. L. Duke (Ed.), Classroom management (78th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 2). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kounin, J. S. (1970). Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Kounin, J. S., & Gump, P. V. (1958). The ripple effect in discipline. Elementary School Journal, 59, 158-162.

Kounin, J. S., & Gump, P. V. (1974). Signal systems of lesson settings and the task related behavior of preschool children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 66, 554-562.

Lahey, B. B., & Rubinoff, A. (1981). Behavior therapy in education. In L. Michelson, M. Hersen, & S. M. Turner (Eds.), Future perspectives in behavior therapy. New York: Plenum Press.

LeCompte, M. D. (1978). Learning to work: The hidden curriculum of the classroom. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 9, 22-37.

Leeper, M., & Green, D. (1978). The hidden costs of rewards: New Perspectives on the psychology of human motivation. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Leonard, C. M. (1984). Evaluation report on "PASS:" Positive Alternatives to Student Suspensions. Portland, OR: Portland Public Schools, Research and Evaluation Department. ED 256 772

McDermott, R. P. (1976). Kids make sense: An ethnographic account of the interactional management of success and failure in one first-grade classroom. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford CA.

McHoul, A. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. Language in Society, 7, 183-213.

McLaughlin, T. F. (1976). Self-control in the classroom. Review of Educational Research, 46, 631-663.

Mehan, H. (1980). The competent student. Anthropology and Educational Quarterly, 11, 131-152,

Merritt, M. (1982). Distributing and directing attention in primary classrooms. In L. C. Wilkinson (Ed.), Communicating in the classroom. New York: Academic Press.

Metz, M. (1978). Classrooms and corridors. Berkeley: University of California Press.

O'Leary, K. D., & O'Leary, S. G. (1977). Classroom management: The successful use of behavior modification (2nd ed.). New York: Pergamon.

Parents Union for Public Schools. (1982). Suspended students - Suspended learning: A report on suspensions in the Philadelphia public schools. Phildelphia, PA: Parents Union for Public Schools. ED 263 270

Parke, R. D., & Duer, J. L. (1972). Schedule of punishment and inhibition of aggression in children. Developmental Psychology, 4, 266-269.

Philips, S. U. (1972). Participation structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classrooms. In C. B. Cazden, V. P. Johns, & D. Hymes (Eds.), Functions of language in the classroom. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Phillips, J. S., & Ray, R. S. (1980). Behavioral approaches to children's disorders. Behavior Modification, 4, 3-34.

Pittman, S. I. (1985). A cognitive ethnography and quantification of a first-grade teacher's selection routines for classroom management. Elementary School Journal, 85, 541-557.

Rose, T. L. (1984). Current uses of corporal punishment in American public schools. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 427-441.

Ross, R. P. (1984). Classroom segments: The structuring of school time. In L. W. Anderson (Ed.), Time and school learning: Theory, research, and practice., London: Croom Helm.

Sawin, D. B., & Parke, R. D. (1979). Inconsistent discipline or aggression in young boys. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 28, 525-538.

Short, P. M., & Noblit, G. W. (1985). Missing the mark in in-school suspension: An explanation and proposal. NASSP Bulletin, 69(484), 112-116.

Shultz, J., & Florio, S. (1979). Stop and freeze: The negotiation of social and physical space in a kindergarten/first grade classroom. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 10, 166-181.

Sieber, R. T. (1976). Schooling in the bureaucratic classroom: Socialization and social reproduction in Chestnut Heights. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University.

Sieber, R. T. (1979). Classmates as workmates: Informal peer activity in the elementary school. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 10, 207-235.

Smith, L. M., & Geoffrey, W. (1968). The complexities of an urban classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Spaulding, R. L. (1983). Applications of low-inference observation in teacher education. In D. C. Smith (Ed.), Essential knowledge for beginning educators. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Stevens, L. B. (1983). Suspension and corporal punishment of students in the Cleveland public schools, 1981-1982. Cleveland, OH: Cleveland Public Schools, Office of School Monitoring and Community Relations. ED 263 269

Stodolosky, S. S. (1984). Frameworks for studying instructional processes in peer work-groups. In P. L. Peterson, L. C. Wilkinson, & M. Hallinan (Eds.), The social context of instruction. New York: Academic Press.

Thompson, M., Brassell, W., Persons, S., Tucker, R., & Rollins, H. (1974). Contingency management in the schools: How often and how well does it work? American Educational Research Journal, 11, 19-28.

Tikunoff, W. J., & Ward, B. A. (1978). A naturalistic study of the initiation of students into three classroom social systems (Rep. No. A-78-11). San Francisco: Far West Laboratory.

Walker, H. M., & Holland, F. (1979). Issues, strategies, and perspectives in the management of disruptive child behavio. in the classroom. Journal of Education, 161(2), 25-50.

Wallat, C., & Green, J. L. (1979). Social rules and communicative contexts in kindergarten. Theory into Practice, 18(4), 275-284.

Weinstein, C. S. (1979). The physical environment of the school: A review of the research. Review of Educational Research, 49, 557-610.

Workman, E., & Hector, M. (1978). Behavioral self-control in classroom settings: A review of the literature. Journal of School Psychology, 16, 227-236.

Yinger, R. J. (1980). A study of teacher planning. Elementary School Journal, 80, 107-127.